arXiv:1207.5420v1 [quant-ph] 23 Jul 2012

Extremal measurements on quantum channels

Anna Jenčová
Mathematical Institute, Slovak Academy of Sciences,
Štefánikova 49, 814 73 Bratislava, Slovakia
jenca@mat.savba.sk

Abstract. A measurement on a section K of the set of states is defined as an affine map from K to the set of probability measures on the set of outcomes. Such measurements correspond to equivalence classes of so-called generalized positive operator valued measures (POVMs). A special case is the set of all channels $B(\mathcal{H}) \to B(\mathcal{K})$, for finite dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$, which can be identified with a section of the set of states on $B(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H})$. The corresponding generalized POVMs are the so-called quantum 1-testers. We find extremality conditions for measurements on K. Moreover, we characterize generalized POVMs such that the corresponding measurement is extremal. These results are applied to the set of channels. We find explicit extremality conditions for two outcome measurements on qubit channels and give an example of an extremal qubit 1-tester such that the corresponding measurement is not extremal.

1 Introduction

In the mathematical formulation of quantum mechanics, a quantum mechanical system is represented by a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of operators acting on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Here, the observables of the system are identified with self-adjoint elements in $\mathcal{A}$ and the physical states of the system are given by positive unital functionals on $\mathcal{A}$. We will consider the case when $\mathcal{H}$ is finite dimensional, then the set of states can be identified with the set $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ of density operators, that is, positive elemets in $\mathcal{A}$ with unit trace.

The evolution of the system is described by a transformation T on the states. Here T is usually required to be a completely positive and trace preserving map from $\mathcal{A}$ to another (finite dimensional) C^*-algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Such map is called a channel $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$, the set of all such channels will be denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

Suppose a measurement is performed on the system $\mathcal{A}$, with values in some finite set U. Then we obtain the outcome $u \in U$ with some probability $p_\rho(u)$, depending on the state ρ of the system. Suppose that the system is known to be in some state in the set $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\}$ with corresponding probabilities $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$, this corresponds to the convex mixture $\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i \rho_i$. Then we obtain the outcome u with probability $\sum_i \lambda_i p_{\rho_i}(u)$, so that $p_\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i p_{\rho_i}$. Hence a measurement is an affine map from the convex set of states $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ to the convex set of probability measures $\mathsf{P}(U)$ on U.

It is well known that there is a one-to-one correspondence between measurements and positive operator valued measures (POVMs). We will suppose that the set U is finite, then a POVM is a sequence $M = \{M_u, u \in U\}$ of positive operators in $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\sum_u M_u = I_\mathcal{A}$, here $I_\mathcal{A}$ is the identity operator in $\mathcal{A}$. The corresponding outcome probability on U is then given by

$$p_\rho(u) = \operatorname{Tr} \rho M_u, \qquad u \in U. \tag{1}$$

If all operators M_u are projections, then M is called a projection valued measure (PVM). Via the spectral theorem, projection valued measures are identified with self adjoint operators in $\mathcal{A}$. The set of all POVMs will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{A}, U)$.

Now suppose that some quantum device is described by a quantum channel $T : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$. This channel is unknown and the task is to obtain some information to identify the device. For example, one can apply T to some input state $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ and then measure the output by some $M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}, U)$. The probability to obtain the outcome $u \in U$ is given by

$$p_T(u) = \operatorname{Tr} T(\rho) M_u, \qquad u \in U$$

It is clear that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a convex set and the map $T \mapsto p_T$ is affine. Similarly as before, we can identify measurements on quantum channels with affine maps $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \to \mathsf{P}(U)$.

Via the Choi representation, the set $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{A})$ can be identified with a convex subset in $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})$. Hence measurements on quantum channels can be identified with affine maps from certain convex subset of the set of states into $\mathsf{P}(U)$. There might be other reasons to restrict the set of states to a convex subset $K \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$, for example, there can be a prior knowledge that the true state $\rho \in K$. In any case, it is natural to extend this definition to any convex set of states.

Definition 1 *Let $K \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ be a convex subset. Then a measurement on K with values in U is an affine mapping $\mathbf{m} : K \to \mathsf{P}(U)$. The set of all such measurements will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$.*

It is clear that any POVM defines a measurement on K, but the above definition allows for a larger set of measurements.

As it was proved in [8], if K is a section of the state space, that is, an intersection of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ by a vector subspace of $\mathcal{A}$, then measurements on K correspond to so-called generalized POVMs, which are sequences $\{M_u, u \in U\}$ of positive operators, summing up to some element $d \in I_\mathcal{A} + K^\perp$. Here the outcome probabilities are again given by (1). The correspondence between measurements and generalized POVMs is not one-to-one, in general, there are many generalized POVMs giving the same measurement. It is therefore more precise to say that measurements on K correspond to equivalence classes of generalized POVMs.

It is easy to see that the set of generalized POVMs is convex, and if K contains an invertible element, it is also compact, this follows from [8, Proposition 6]. Since $\mathcal{M}(U, K)$ is the image of the set of generalized POVMs under a linear map, namely the quotient map that maps each generalized POVM to its equivalence class, it is convex and compact as well. Therefore it is natural to ask what are the extreme points of both of this sets, since all elements are convex combinations of extreme points. On the other hand, many optimization problems consist in maximalization of a convex function, so that the maximum is attained at an extreme point.

Extremal generalized POVMs were characterized in [9], but these do not necessarily correspond to extremal measurements. In fact, two situations might occur: it might happen that a non-extremal generalized POVM is equivalent to an extremal one and the measurement they define is extremal and, secondly, there are extremal generalized POVMs such that the corresponding measurement is not extremal. This is important, since in many cases the functions to be optimalized depend on the outcome probabilities and hence are functions of the measurements, rather than functions of generalized POVMs.

An important example of a section of the state space is (a multiple of) the set of channels $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, hence any measurement on channels is given by a generalized POVM. These were called the proces POVMs (or PPOVMs) in [11] or quantum 1-testers in [2]. In fact, very general quantum protocols can be identified with (multiples of) sections, including quantum combs and testers, [1, 3], see also [7]. Extremal quantum testers were characterized also in [6].

The aim of the present paper is to characterize extremal measurements on a section $K = J \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ of the state space, with some focus on the set of channels. For this, we write the set $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$, as well as the set of generalized POVMs with respect to J, as and intersection of a positive cone with an affine subspace. We also characterize generalized POVMs such that the corresponding measurement is extremal. These reasults are then applied to the case of channels with qubit input and output.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite dimensional C^*-algebra. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of matrix algebras, that is, there are finite dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots \mathcal{H}_n$, such that

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \bigoplus_j B(\mathcal{H}_j)$$

Below we always assume that $\mathcal{A}$ has this form and fix a suitable basis in $\mathcal{H} = \oplus_j \mathcal{H}_j$, so that $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra of block-diagonal elements in the matrix algebra $B(\mathcal{H})$. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we denote by a^{T} the transpose of a with respect to the fixed basis.

The identity in $\mathcal{A}$ will be denoted by $I_{\mathcal{A}}$. We fix a trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ to be the restriction of the trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}$ in $B(\mathcal{H})$, we omit the subscript $\mathcal{A}$ if no confusion is possible. We denote by $\mathcal{A}^h$ the set of all self-adjoint elements in $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{A}^+$ the convex cone of positive elements in $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ the set of states on $\mathcal{A}$, which will be identified with the set of density operators in $\mathcal{A}$, that is, elements $\rho \in \mathcal{A}^+$ with $\mathrm{Tr}\,\rho = 1$. For $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, the projection onto the support of a will be denoted by $s(a)$. If $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$, we use the notation $I_{\mathcal{H}}$, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ etc., with obvious meaning.

If $\mathcal{B}$ is another C^* algebra, then $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mathcal{A}\otimes\mathcal{B}}$ will denote the partial trace on the tensor product $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{B}$, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}(a \otimes b) = \mathrm{Tr}\,(a)b$. If the input space is clear, we will denote the partial trace just by $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

2.1 Quantum channels and quantum supermaps

Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ be finite dimensional C^* algebras and let $T : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ be a linear map. Then T is positive if $T(\mathcal{A}^+) \subset \mathcal{B}^+$ and completely positive if the map

$$T \otimes id_{\mathcal{L}} : \mathcal{A} \otimes B(\mathcal{L}) \to \mathcal{B} \otimes B(\mathcal{L})$$

is positive for all finite dimensional Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{L}$. A channel $T : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ is a completely positive and trace preserving map.

For any channel $T : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$, there is a unique positive operator $X_T \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}$, called the Choi matrix of T, satisfying

$$T(a) = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}}(I_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes a^{\mathsf{T}})X_T, \qquad a \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{2}$$

see [5]. If $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$, then we have

$$X_T = T \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}}(|\psi_{\mathcal{H}}\rangle\langle\psi_{\mathcal{H}}|), \qquad |\psi_{\mathcal{H}}\rangle = \sum_i |i \otimes i\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$$

where $|i\rangle$ denotes an orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{A} = \oplus_n B(\mathcal{H}_n)$, then there are channels $T_n : B(\mathcal{H}_n) \to \mathcal{B}$ such that $T(a) = T_n(a)$ for $a \in B(\mathcal{H}_n)$, and $X_T = \oplus_n X_{T_n}$.

Note that since T preserves trace, its Choi matrix satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}} X_T = I_{\mathcal{A}}$. Conversely, any positive element $X \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ satisfying this condition defines a channel $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ via (2). Hence we may identify the set $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ of all channels $\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ with the set

$$\{X \in (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^+,\ \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}} X = I_{\mathcal{A}}\}.$$

By a slight abuse of notation, we will denote this set also by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

Let $\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots$ be a sequence of finite dimensional C^* algebras. We denote by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n)$ the set of (Choi matrices of) the completely positive maps $\mathcal{B}_{n-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{B}_0 \to \mathcal{B}_n$ such that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_{n-1})$ is mapped into $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{B}_n)$. The elements of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n)$ are called quantum supermaps, [8]. If n is odd, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n)$ corresponds to the set of (conditional) quantum combs, which are defined as (Choi matrices of) completely positive maps $\mathcal{B}_{n-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{B}_1 \to \mathcal{B}_n \otimes \mathcal{B}_0$, such that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_{n-1})$ is mapped into $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_n)$. Quantum combs are used for representation of general quantum networks, [1, 3, 7]. The most general form of a conditional comb was introduced in [4], see also [9].

2.2 Convex sets, cones and faces

In this paragraph, we list some definitions and facts from convex analysis, which will be needed below. Details can be found in [10].

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a finite dimensional real vector space and let $L \subset \mathcal{V}$ be an affine subspace. Then $\mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{y - x, y, x \in L\}$ is a linear subspace and $\mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{y - x, y \in L\}$ for any fixed $x \in L$. Hence we have $L = x + \mathrm{Lin}(L)$ for any $x \in L$.

Let $C \subset \mathcal{V}$ be a convex subset, then $\mathrm{Aff}(C)$ denotes the smallest affine subspace containing C. The relative interior $ri(C)$ is the interior of C in $\mathrm{Aff}(C)$. For $c \in C$, $c \in ri(C)$ if and only if for any $d \in C$ there is some $t < 0$ such that $td + (1 - t)c \in C$. The closure of C will be denoted by $cl(C)$. We have $ri(cl(C)) = ri(C)$ and $cl(ri(C)) = cl(C)$. If C is an affine subspace, then $cl(C) = ri(C) = C$.

Let $C \subset \mathcal{V}$ be a closed convex subset. A subset $F \subseteq C$ is a face of C if $q = \lambda q_1 + (1 - \lambda)q_2$ for $q \in F$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ implies $q_1, q_2 \in F$. The sets $\emptyset$ and C are trivial faces of C. Clearly, intersection of faces is again a face, so that for each $d \in C$, there is the smallest face of C containing d.

If F is a face of C and $D \subseteq C$ is a convex subset such that $ri(D) \cap F \neq \emptyset$, then $D \subseteq F$. In particular, F is a closed convex subset in C. If F is a face of C containing D, then F is the smallest face containing D if and only if $D \cap ri(F) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover,

$$C = \bigcup_{F \in \mathcal{F}(C)} ri(F)$$

is a partition of C, where $\mathcal{F}(C)$ is the set of all faces of C.

A subset $V \subset \mathcal{V}$ is a convex cone if $\lambda q_1 + \mu q_2 \in V$ whenever $q_1, q_2 \in V$ and $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$. Since $0 \in V$, we have $\mathrm{Lin}(V) = \mathrm{Aff}(V) = V - V$. The cone is pointed if $V \cap -V = \{0\}$. Closed pointed cones are in one-to-one correspondence with partial orders in $\mathcal{V}$, by $x \leq_V y \iff y - x \in V$. If also $\mathrm{Aff}(V) = \mathcal{V}$, we say that V is a positive cone in $\mathcal{V}$.

Let $\mathcal{V}^*$ be the dual space of $\mathcal{V}$ and let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the duality. The dual cone of V is defined as

$$V^* = \{q^* \in \mathcal{V}^*, \langle q^*, q \rangle \geq 0, q \in V\}.$$

This is a closed cone and $V^{**} = V$ if V is closed. Moreover, a closed convex cone V is pointed if and only if $\mathrm{Aff}(V^*) = \mathcal{V}^*$, hence the dual of a positive cone is a positive cone as well.

Let U be a finite set. Let us denote by $\ell_U(\mathcal{V})$ the space of all sequences $x = \{x_u, u \in U\}$ of elements $x_u \in \mathcal{V}$. Then $\ell_U(\mathcal{V})^* = \ell_U(\mathcal{V}^*)$, with duality $\langle x^*, y \rangle = \sum_u \langle x^*_u, y_u \rangle$. If $V \subset \mathcal{V}$ is a positive cone, then $\ell_U(V) = \{v = \{v_u \in V, u \in U\}\}$ is a positive cone in $\ell_U(\mathcal{V})$ and $\ell_U(V)^* = \ell_U(V^*)$.

For any set $D \subset \mathcal{V}$ we denote

$$D^\perp = \{v^* \in \mathcal{V}^*, \langle v^*, v \rangle = 0\}$$

Then $D^\perp$ is a linear subspace in $\mathcal{V}^*$. If $V \subset \mathcal{V}$ is a linear subspace (and hence, in particular, a closed convex cone), then $V^* = V^\perp$.

Let V be a closed convex cone. Then a subcone $F \subseteq V$ is a face of V if and only if $x + y \in F$ for $x, y \in V$ implies that $x, y \in F$. The faces of $\ell_U(V)$ are subcones of the form $\oplus_{u \in U} F_u$, where F_u is a face of V for all $u \in U$.

Let

$$\hat{F} := \{q^* \in V^*, \langle q, q^* \rangle = 0\} = V^* \cap F^\perp,$$

then $\hat{F}$ is a face of V^*. If $F = \hat{\hat{F}}$, then we say that the face F is exposed. This is the case if and only if $F = V \cap \{q^*\}^\perp$ for some $q^* \in V^*$.

Let $L \subset \mathcal{V}$ be an affine subspace and let $C = L \cap V$. The next Lemma describes the faces of C.

Lemma 1 *All faces of C have the form $L \cap F$ for some face F of V.*

Proof. It is clear that all such intersections are faces of C. Let now E be a face of C and let F be the face of V generated by E. Then E is contained in the face $L \cap F$ and there is some element in $x \in ri(F)$, such that $x \in E \subseteq L$. Hence by [10, Corollary 6.5.1],

$$ri(L \cap F) = L \cap ri(F) \ni x$$

Since also $x \in E$, we have $E = L \cap F$. □

We also determine all extreme points of C.

Lemma 2 *Let $c \in C$ and let F be the smallest face of V containing c. Then c is extremal if and only if*

$$\mathrm{Aff}(F) \cap \mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{0\}$$

Proof. Let c be extremal and let $x \in \mathrm{Aff}(F) \cap \mathrm{Lin}(L)$. Then since $c \in ri(F)$, there is some $t > 0$ such that $c_\pm := c \pm tx \in F \subseteq V$. Moreover, $c_\pm \in c + \mathrm{Lin}(L) = L$, so that $c_\pm \in C$. But we also have $c = \frac{1}{2}(c_+ + c_-)$, so that $c_+ = c_- = c$ and $x = 0$.

Conversely, suppose that $c = \frac{1}{2}(c_1 + c_2)$ for some $c_1, c_2 \in C$, then $c_1, c_2 \in F$ and hence $x := c_1 - c_2 \in \mathrm{Aff}(F)$. But $c_1, c_2 \in L$, so that we also have $x \in \mathrm{Lin}(L)$. It follows that $x = 0$ and $c_1 = c_2 = c$.

□

3 Positive affine functions on convex sets of states

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a finite dimensional C^*-algebra and let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{A}^h$. We will identify $\mathcal{V}^* \equiv \mathcal{V}$, with duality given by $\langle a, b \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}\, ab$. The set of positive elements $\mathcal{A}^+$ is a positive cone in $\mathcal{A}^h$. Moreover, $\mathcal{A}^+$ is self-dual, $(\mathcal{A}^+)^* = \mathcal{A}^+$.

Let $K \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ be a convex subset. Let $Q := \cup_{\lambda \geq 0} \lambda K \subseteq \mathcal{A}^+$ be the convex cone and $J := Q - Q \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h$ the real vector subspace generated by K, then Q is a positive cone in J. This time, we will identify the dual space of J with the quotient of $\mathcal{A}^h$, $J^* \equiv \mathcal{A}^h|_{J^\perp}$. Let $\pi : \mathcal{A}^h \to J^*$ be the quotient map, $\pi(a) = a + J^\perp$. Then the duality of J and J^* is given by

$$\langle \pi(a), x\rangle = \operatorname{Tr} ax, \qquad a \in \mathcal{A}^h,\ x \in J$$

Let $Q^* \subseteq J^*$ be the dual cone to Q. Then it is clear that we may identify the set of positive affine functions on K with Q^*. We have $\pi(\mathcal{A}^+) \subseteq Q^*$, since $Q \subseteq \mathcal{A}^+$. It was proved in [8] that $\pi(\mathcal{A}^+) = Q^*$ if and only if Q is a section of $\mathcal{A}^+$, that is, $Q = J \cap \mathcal{A}^+$, equivalently, K is a section of $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$, $K = J \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$. In this case, any positive affine function on K has the form

$$\rho \mapsto \operatorname{Tr} a\rho, \qquad \rho \in K$$

for some $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$.

It is easy to see that a subset $K \subseteq \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ is a section if and only if $K = L \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A}^+)$ for some subspace $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h$, and that if L is positively generated, then $L = J$. Moreover, L is positively generated if and only if there is a positive element $a \in L$ such that $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h_{s(a)}$, [8]. We will next show some important examples of sections.

Example 1 (**Quantum channels**) Let

$$J_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} := \{X \in (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^h, \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}} X = tI_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

then $J_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}$ is a linear subspace in $(\mathcal{B}\otimes\mathcal{A})^h$ and since $I_{\mathcal{B}\otimes\mathcal{A}} \in J_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}$, it is positively generated. Let $K = J_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{B}\otimes\mathcal{A})$, then $K = (\operatorname{Tr} I_{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ and since K is a section, it follows that any positive affine function on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ is given by a positive element $a \in \mathcal{B}\otimes\mathcal{A}$. We have

$$J^\perp_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} = I_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}^h),$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}^h)$ is the set of elements in $\mathcal{A}^h$ with zero trace.

Example 2 (**Quantum instruments**) In Example 1, we put $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{C}^m \otimes B(\mathcal{K})$. Then for any $T \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ there are some maps $T_i : B(\mathcal{H}) \to B(\mathcal{K})$ such that

$$T(a) = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes T_i(a), \qquad a \in \mathcal{A}.$$

It is clear that all T_i must be completely positive and $\sum_i T_i$ is trace preserving, hence a channel. Such T is called an instrument $B(\mathcal{H}) \to B(\mathcal{K})$ with values in $\{1,\dots,m\}$. The Choi matrix of T has the form

$$X_T = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes X_{T_i},$$

with $X_{T_i} \in B(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})^+$ and $\sum_i \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} X_{T_i} = I_{\mathcal{H}}$. In particular, if $\dim(\mathcal{K}) = 1$, then $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ is the set of all POVMs $\{1,\dots,m\} \to B(\mathcal{H})$.

Note next that $\rho \mapsto \operatorname{Tr} T_i(\rho)$, $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, defines a measurement on $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with values in $\{1, \dots, m\}$. This measurement is given by a POVM $M = \{M_1, \dots, M_m\}$, where $M_i = T_i^*(I_{\mathcal{K}})$ is determined by $\operatorname{Tr} M_i a = \operatorname{Tr} T_i(a)$, $a \in B(\mathcal{H})$. We say that the instrument T is M-compatible, in this case. Let

$$J_M := \{X = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes X_i \in \mathbb{C}^m \otimes B(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H})^h,\ \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} X = t \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes M_i^{\mathsf{T}},\ t \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

then the set $\dim(\mathcal{H})\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A}) \cap J_M$ corresponds to the set of all M-compatible quantum instruments. Note that $I_M := \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes M_i^{\mathsf{T}}$ is a positive element in J_M, such that $J_M \subseteq (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^h_{s(I_M)}$, so that J_M is positively generated. In this case,

$$J_M^{\perp} = \{\sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes Y_i,\ Y_i \in \{M_i^{\mathsf{T}}\}^{\perp},\ i = 1, \dots, m\}$$

Example 3 (**Quantum supermaps**) As it was shown in [8], the set of quantum supermaps is again a (multiple of) section of a state space: we have $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \dots, \mathcal{B}_n) = J_n \cap c_n \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A}_n)$, where $c_n := \Pi_{l=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} \operatorname{Tr}(I_{\mathcal{B}_{n-1-2l}})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_{2k-1} &= S_{2k-1}^{-1}(S_{2k-2}^*(S_{2k-3}^{-1}(\dots S_1^{-1}(\mathbb{C} I_{\mathcal{B}_0}) \dots))) && (3) \\ J_{2k} &= S_{2k}^{-1}(S_{2k-1}^*(S_{2k-2}^{-1}(\dots S_1^*(\mathcal{B}_0) \dots))) && (4) \end{aligned}$$

here $S_n : \mathcal{A}_n \to \mathcal{A}_{n-1}$ denotes the partial trace $\operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}_n}^{\mathcal{A}_n}$, $n = 1, 2, \dots$, see also Remark 1.

3.1 Dual cones of sections of $\mathcal{A}^+$

In this paragraph, we describe the faces of the dual cone Q^* if Q is a section of $\mathcal{A}^+$.

It is known all faces of $\mathcal{A}^+$ are exposed and there is a one-to-one correspondence between faces of $\mathcal{A}^+$ and projections $p \in \mathcal{A}^+$, given by

$$p \mapsto \mathcal{A}_p^+ := p\mathcal{A}^+ p = \{a \in \mathcal{A}^+,\ s(a) \le p\}.$$

Clearly, if $F = \mathcal{A}_p^+$, then $\hat{F} = \mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}_p^+ = \{b\}^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ for any $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ with $s(b) = I - p$.

Suppose now that $J \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h$ is a positively generated subspace and $Q = J \cap \mathcal{A}^+$, so that $Q^* = \pi(\mathcal{A}^+)$.

Lemma 3 *Let $E \subseteq Q^*$ be a subcone. Then E is a face of Q^* if and only if $\pi^{-1}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ is a face of $\mathcal{A}^+$.*

Proof. Follows easily from the fact that any element in Q^* has the form $\pi(a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$ and $\pi(b) \in E$ for $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ if and only if $b \in \pi^{-1}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$.

$\square$

Let F be a face of $\mathcal{A}^+$. Then it is easy to see that $F = \pi^{-1}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ for some face E of Q^* if and only if

$$F = \pi^{-1}(\pi(F)) \cap \mathcal{A}^+ = (F + J^{\perp}) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$$

Lemma 4 *Let $F = \mathcal{A}_p^+$ be a face of $\mathcal{A}^+$. Then $F = (F + J^\perp) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ if and only if $I - p = s(b)$ for some $b \in Q$.*

Proof. Suppose $F = (F + J^\perp) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$. Let us choose any element $a \in ri(F)$, then $s(a) = p$. Note that we have

$$\{x \in \mathcal{A}^h,\ \exists t > 0,\ a + tx \in \mathcal{A}^+\} = \mathcal{A}^+ + \mathrm{Aff}(F) = \mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h \tag{5}$$

Indeed, let $x = b + y$ for some $b \in \mathcal{A}^+$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}_p^h$. Then since $s(a) = p$, there exists some $t > 0$, such that $a + ty \in F$. Hence $a + tx \in \mathcal{A}^+$, so that $\mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h$ is included in the set on the left hand side. The converse inclusion is clear.

Let now $x \in (\mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h) \cap J^\perp$, then (5) implies that there is some $t > 0$ such that $a_0 := a + tx \in (a + J^\perp) \cap \mathcal{A}^+ \subseteq F$. This implies that $x = t^{-1}(a_0 - a) \in \mathcal{A}_p^h$, so that $(\mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h) \cap J^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{A}_p^h \cap J^\perp$. Since the converse inclusion is clear, we have

$$(\mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h) \cap J^\perp = \mathcal{A}_p^h \cap J^\perp$$

Applying the duality * of the convex cones to this equality, we get ([10, Corollary 11.4.2])

$$cl((\mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h)^* + J) = cl(F^\perp + J).$$

Since $F^\perp + J$ is an affine subspace, we may remove the closure operator and we get from $(\mathcal{A}^+ + \mathcal{A}_p^h)^* = \mathcal{A}^+ \cap F^\perp = \hat{F} = \mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+$ that

$$\mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+ + J = F^\perp + J$$

In particular, since $-\mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+ \subset F^\perp$, we have $-\mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+ \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+ + J$. Let $c \in \mathcal{A}^+$, $s(c) = I - p$, then there are some $d \in \mathcal{A}_{I-p}^+$ and $x \in J$ such that $-c = d + x$. But then $b := c + d \in Q$, $s(b) = I - p$.

Conversely, let $b \in Q$, $s(b) = I - p$, then

$$F = \{b\}^\perp \cap \mathcal{A}^+ \supseteq (F + J^\perp) \cap \mathcal{A}^+ \supseteq F$$

□

Let us denote

$$\mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{A}) := \{I - s(b), b \in Q\}$$

Proposition 1 *There is a one-to-one correspondence between faces E of Q^* and projections $p \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{A})$. The correspondence is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} p &\mapsto E = \pi(\mathcal{A}_p^+) = \{\mathbf{a} \in Q^*, \langle \mathbf{a}, b\rangle = 0\} \\ E &\mapsto \pi^{-1}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}^+ = \mathcal{A}_p^+ = \{a \in \mathcal{A}^+, \mathrm{Tr}\, ab = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

where $b \in Q$ is such that $p = I - s(b)$. In particular, all faces of Q^* are exposed.

Proof. Follows easily by Lemmas 3 and 4.

□

Let $\mathbf{a} \in Q^*$. We are interested in the smallest face of Q^* containing $\mathbf{a}$. The corresponding projection $p \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{A})$ will be called the support of $\mathbf{a}$ and denoted by $s(\mathbf{a})$.

Lemma 5 *Let* $\mathbf{a} \in Q^*$ *and let* E *be the smallest face of* Q^* *containing* $\mathbf{a}$*. Then* $\pi^{-1}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ *is the smallest face of* $\mathcal{A}^+$ *containing* $\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{a}) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$*.*

Proof. Let F be the smallest face of $\mathcal{A}^+$ containing $\pi^{-1}(\mathbf{a}) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ and let $F' = \pi^{-1}(E) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$. Then since F' is a face of $\mathcal{A}^+$, we have $F \subseteq F'$.

Further, we have $E = \pi(F')$ and the map $\pi : \mathcal{A}^h \to J^*$ is linear, so that [10, Theorem 6.6.],

$$ri(E) = ri(\pi(F')) = \pi(ri(F')).$$

Since $\mathbf{a} \in ri(E)$, there is some $a \in ri(F')$, such that $\pi(a) = \mathbf{a}$. But then $a \in \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{a}) \cap \mathcal{A}^+ \subseteq F$, hence $ri(F') \cap F \neq \emptyset$ and $F = F'$.

□

3.2 The J-support

Let $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$. Denote

$$G_J(a) := \pi^{-1}(\pi(a)) \cap \mathcal{A}^+ = (a + J^\perp) \cap \mathcal{A}^+,$$

then $G_J(a)$ is the set of elements in $\mathcal{A}^+$ that define the same positive linear functional on Q as a. Let $d \in \mathcal{A}^+$, then it is clear that $d \in G_J(a)$ if and only if $G_J(a) = G_J(d)$. Moreover, $G_J(a)$ is a closed convex subset of $\mathcal{A}^+$ and there is an element $d \in G_J(a)$ such that $s(c) \leq s(d)$ for all $c \in G_J(a)$. In this case, $s(d)$ is called the J-support of a and will be denoted by $s_J(a)$.

Proposition 2 *Let* $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$*. Then*

(i) $s_J(a) = s(\pi(a))$*.*

(ii) $s_J(a)$ *is the smallest projection* $s \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{A})$*, such that* $s(a) \leq s$*.*

Proof. (i) Let $s = s_J(a)$, then $F = \mathcal{A}_s^+$ is the smallest face of $\mathcal{A}^+$ containing $G_J(a)$. By Lemma 5 and Proposition 1, $s = s(\pi(a))$.

(ii) By (i), $s_J(a) \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{A})$ and $s(a) \leq s_J(a)$ by definition. Let s' be another such projection, with $1 - s' = s(b')$, $b' \in Q$. Then $\operatorname{Tr} b'd = \operatorname{Tr} b'a = 0$ for all $d \in G_J(a)$. This implies $s(d) \leq 1 - s(b') = s'$ for all $d \in G_J(a)$, so that $s_J(a) \leq s'$.

□

Since $G_J(a)$ is the intersection of $\mathcal{A}^+$ by the affine subspace $L = a + J^\perp$, all faces of $G_J(a)$ are of the form $G_J(a) \cap F = (a + J^\perp) \cap F$ for some face F of $\mathcal{A}^+$, by Lemma 1.

Proposition 3 *Let* $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$*, then* $a \in ri(G_J(a))$ *if and only if* $s(a) = s_J(a)$*.*

Proof. Let $s = s(a)$ and let $F = \mathcal{A}_s^+$, then $G_J(a) \cap F$ is a face of $G_J(a)$ and $a \in ri(G_J(a) \cap F)$ [10]. It follows that $a \in ri(G_J(a))$ if and only if $G_J(a) \subseteq F$, in this case $s(a) = s_J(a)$.

□

We can also use Lemma 2 to determine the extremal points in $G_J(a)$. We will need the following simple observation.

Lemma 6 *Let $N \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h$ be any subspace and let $p \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Let us denote $N_p := pNp \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h_p$. Then*

$$N_p^{\perp_p} := N_p^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{A}^h_p = N^{\perp} \cap \mathcal{A}^h_p$$

Proof. Let $x \in N_p^{\perp_p}$, then for all $z \in N$, $\operatorname{Tr} xz = \operatorname{Tr} xpzp = 0$, hence $x \in N^{\perp}$. The converse is proved similarly.

□

Proposition 4 *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, $s := s(a)$. The following are equivalent.*

- *(i)* *a is extremal in $G_J(a)$.*
- *(ii)* $\mathcal{A}^h_s \cap J^{\perp} = \{0\}$.
- *(iii)* $\dim(J_s) = \dim(\mathcal{A}^h_s)$.

Proof. Let $L = a + J^{\perp}$, then $\operatorname{Lin}(L) = J^{\perp}$ and by Lemma 2, (i) is equivalent with (ii). By Lemma 6, (ii) is equivalent with $J_s = \mathcal{A}^h_s$. Since we always have $J_s \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h_s$, this is equivalent with (iii).

□

Corollary 1 *Let $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, $s = s(a)$. Then $G_J(a) = \{a\}$ if and only if $s \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{A})$ and $\dim(J_s) = \dim(\mathcal{A}^h_s)$.*

Proof. Clear from Propositions 3 and 4.

□

Remark 1 Let $L \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ be a (complex) linear subspace. Let us denote $L^h := L \cap \mathcal{A}^h$, then L^h is a real vector subspace in $\mathcal{A}^h$. The subspace L is self-adjoint if $a^* \in L$ whenever $a \in L$. In this case $L = L^h \oplus iL^h$. It si clear that if L is generated by positive elements, then it is self-adjoint and L^h is a positively generated (real) linear subspace in $\mathcal{A}^h$. Moreover, the (complex) dimension of L is equal to the (real) dimension of L^h. Let L' denote the orthogonal complement in $\mathcal{A}$ with respect to the complex inner product $\langle a, b\rangle = \operatorname{Tr} a^*b$, then L' is self-adjoint as well and we have $(L')^h = (L^h)^{\perp}$. Since $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap L = \mathcal{A}^+ \cap L^h$ and $(a + L') \cap \mathcal{A}^+ = (a + (L')^h) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}^+$, it is clear that we may replace $\mathcal{A}^h$ by $\mathcal{A}$ and J by a complex linear subspace, in all results of this paper.

3.3 Positive affine functions on channels

Recall Example 1, with $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B} = B(\mathcal{K})$. In this case, we will denote $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ and

$$J_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}} := J_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}} = \{X \in B(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H})^h, \operatorname{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} X = tI_{\mathcal{H}}, t \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

so that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}) = J_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}} \cap \dim(\mathcal{H})\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ and $J^{\perp}_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}} = I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes \mathcal{T}(B(\mathcal{H})^h)$.

Let $Q = J_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}} \cap B(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})^+$ and let $p \neq I$ be a projection on $\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}$. Then one can see from the definition that $p \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ if and only if there are one-dimensional projections $p_i = |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|$, $i = 1,\dots,k$ such that $1 - p = \vee_i p_i$ and the convex hull $co\{\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} p_1, \dots, \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} p_k\}$ contains the maximally mixed state $\dim(\mathcal{H})^{-1} I_{\mathcal{H}}$. In particular, if $1 - p = |\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$, then $p \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ if and only if $|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|$ is maximally entangled, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}}|\phi\rangle\langle\phi| = \dim(\mathcal{H})^{-1} I_{\mathcal{H}}$.

While it is not easy to describe the set $G_{J_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}}}(a)$, we can establish the following simple facts.

Lemma 7 *Let* $a \in B(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})^+$ *and let*

$$J = J_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K},\omega} := \{X \in B(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})^h,\ \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} X = t\omega,\ t \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

for some $\omega \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ *with full rank. Then*

(i) If $\mathrm{rank}(a) < \dim(\mathcal{K})$ *then* $G_J(a) = \{a\}$.

(ii) If $\mathrm{rank}(a) < 2\dim(\mathcal{K})$ *then* a *is an extreme point in* $G_J(a)$.

(iii) If

$$\mathrm{rank}(a)^2 > \dim(\mathcal{H})^2\dim(\mathcal{K})^2 - \dim(\mathcal{H})^2 + 1$$

then $G_J(a) \neq \{a\}$.

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{T}_\omega(\mathcal{H}) := \{\omega\}^{\perp} = \{x \in B(\mathcal{H})^h, \mathrm{Tr}\,\omega x = 0\},$$

then $J^{\perp} = I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes \mathcal{T}_\omega(\mathcal{H})$.

(i) Suppose $b \in G_J(a)$, $b \neq a$, then there is some nonzero $y \in \mathcal{T}_\omega(\mathcal{H})$, such that $b = a + I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes y$. Let $y = y_+ - y_-$ be the decomposition of y into its positive and negative part, that is, $y_\pm \in B(\mathcal{H})^+$ and $s(y_+)s(y_-) = 0$. Then we have

$$I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes y_- \leq a + I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes y_+$$

Since we have positive elements on both sides, this implies that

$$I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes s(y_-) \leq s(a + I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes y_+) = s(a) \vee (I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes s(y_+))$$

and since $s(y_+)$ and $s(y_-)$ are orthogonal projections, we must have $\mathrm{rank}(I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes s(y_-)) \leq \mathrm{rank}(s(a))$. It follows that

$$\mathrm{rank}(a) = \mathrm{rank}(s(a)) \geq \mathrm{rank}(I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes s(y_-)) \geq \dim(\mathcal{K}).$$

Hence $\mathrm{rank}(a) < \dim(\mathcal{K})$ implies $G_J(a) = \{a\}$.

(ii) Let $s = s(a)$ and let $0 \neq z \in B(s(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}))^h \cap J^{\perp}$. Let $z = I_{\mathcal{K}} \otimes y$ for $y \in \mathcal{T}_\omega(\mathcal{H})$, then since $y \neq 0$, $\mathrm{rank}(y)$ must be at least 2. Hence $\mathrm{rank}(z) \geq 2\dim(\mathcal{K})$ and we must have $\mathrm{rank}(a) = \mathrm{rank}(s) \geq \mathrm{rank}(z)$. By Proposition 4 (ii), $\mathrm{rank}(a) < 2\dim(\mathcal{K})$ implies that a is an extreme point in $G_J(a)$.

(iii) Let $s = s(a)$. By Corollary 1, $G_J(a) = \{a\}$ implies

$$\mathrm{rank}(a)^2 = \dim(B(s(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}))^h) = \dim(J_s) \leq \dim(J)$$

and $\dim(J) = \dim(B(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H})^h) - \dim(J^\perp)$.

$\square$

Lemma 8 *Suppose* $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \dim(\mathcal{K}) = 2$ *in the previous lemma. Then* $G_J(a) \neq \{a\}$ *if and only if* $s_J(a) = I_{\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. Suppose $s_J(a) = I_{\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}}$, then there is some element $b \in G_J(a)$ such that $s(b) = s_J(a) = I_{\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}}$. By Lemma 7 (iii), $G_J(a) = G_J(b)$ must have more than one element. Conversely, suppose that $G_J(a) \neq \{a\}$ and let $b \in G_J(a)$ be such that $s(b) = s_J(a)$. If $\mathrm{rank}(b) < 4$ then by Lemma 7 (ii), b is an extreme point in $G_J(b)$, so that $G_J(a) = G_J(b) = \{b\}$ has exactly one element. Hence $\mathrm{rank}(b) = 4$ and $s_J(a) = s(b) = I_{\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}}$.

$\square$

Note that the last lemma implies that for any $a \in B(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})^+$ with $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \dim(\mathcal{K}) = 2$ we have either $s_J(a) = s(a)$ or $s_J(a) = I_{\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}}$.

4 Measurements and generalized POVMs

Let K be any convex set of states and let J be the real linear span of K. Let U be a finite set with $|U| = m$ and let $\mathbf{m} : K \to \mathsf{P}(U)$ be a measurement. Then for $u \in U$, $\mathbf{m}_u : K \ni \rho \mapsto \mathbf{m}(\rho)(u)$ defines a positive affine function on K. Hence any measurement is given by som element $\mathbf{m}$ in the positive cone $\ell_U(Q^*) \subset \ell_U(J^*)$. Moreover, since $\mathbf{m}(\rho)$ is a probability measure, we must have $\sum_u \mathbf{m}_u = \pi(I_{\mathcal{A}})$. We will denote the set of all measurements on K with values in U by $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$.

Since $\mathbf{m} \in \ell_U(J^*)$ and $J^* = \mathcal{A}^h|_{J^\perp}$, there is some $M \in \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^h)$ such that

$$\sum_u M_u \in I + J^\perp \tag{6}$$

and $\mathbf{m}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{m}_u(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}\, M_u\rho, \qquad u \in U,\ \rho \in K$$

If $K = J \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ is a section, then we may choose $M \in \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^+)$.

Definition 2 *Let* $J \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h$ *be a positively generated subspace. An element* $M \in \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^+)$*, such that (6) holds is called a generalized POVM with respect to* J*. The set of all generalized POVMs will be denoted by* $\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$*.*

It is clear that any generalized POVM with respect to $J = \mathrm{span}(K)$ defines a measurement on K and the converse is true if and only if K is a section. But, unlike POVMs, this correspondence is not one-to-one. Indeed, if there is at least one $v \in U$ such that there is some element $N_v \neq M_v$ in $G_J(M_v)$, then by replacing M_v by N_v we obtain a different generalized POVM determining the same measurement. If this is the case, that is, if M and N are generalized POVMs with respect to J such that

$$\operatorname{Tr} \rho M_u = \operatorname{Tr} \rho N_u, \qquad u \in U,\ \rho \in K,$$

we say that M and N are equivalent.

Let M be a generalized POVM with respect to J. The following decomposition was obtained in [8, 9]: Let $\sum_u M_u = d$ and $p = s(d)$. Let us define $\chi_d : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ by $a \mapsto d^{1/2} a d^{1/2}$. Then χ_d is completely positive and preserves trace on J, these maps were called simple generalized channels in [8]. Moreover, there is a unique POVM $\Lambda : U \to \mathcal{A}_p$, such that

$$\operatorname{Tr} M_u \rho = \operatorname{Tr} \Lambda_u \chi_d(\rho), \qquad u \in U,\ \rho \in K,$$

which will be denoted by $M = \Lambda \circ \chi_d$.

Example 4 As we have seen in Example 1, the set of channels $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a constant multiple of a section. Though elements of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ are not states, we can again define a measurement on the set of channels as affine maps from $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ to probability distributions. One can then see that any measurement on the set of channels $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is given by an element $M \in \ell_U((\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^+)$ with $\sum_u M_u = I_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \omega$ for some $\omega \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$ [8]. If $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B} = B(\mathcal{K})$, such M is called a quantum 1-tester, [3], or a process POVM (or PPOVM), [11]. We will denote the set of all 1-testers by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, U)$, see also Example 5 below.

Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$. Let $\chi = \chi_{I_{\mathcal{B}} \otimes \omega}$ and let $q = s(\omega)$, so that $M = \Lambda \circ \chi$ with a POVM $\Lambda : U \to \mathcal{B} \otimes B(q\mathcal{H})$. Then one can show that for a channel $T : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{B}$ with Choi matrix X_T,

$$\chi(X_T) = (T \otimes id_{q\mathcal{H}})(\xi)$$

for a pure state $\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes q\mathcal{H})$ with $\operatorname{Tr}_{q\mathcal{H}} \xi = \omega^{\mathsf{T}}$. This gives the following interpretation for the decomposition $M = \Lambda \circ \chi$:

Theorem 1 *[8, 11] For any quantum 1-tester M, there is an ancillary Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$, a pure state $\xi \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$ and a POVM Λ on $\mathcal{B} \otimes B(\mathcal{H}_A)$ such that*

$$\operatorname{Tr} M_u X_T = \operatorname{Tr} \Lambda_u (T \otimes id_{\mathcal{H}_A})(\xi), \qquad u \in U,\ T \in \mathcal{C}(B(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{B})$$

Moreover, the triple $(\mathcal{H}_A, \xi, \Lambda)$ is unique, up to a unitary on $\mathcal{H}_A$.

Example 5 Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n)$ be the set of quantum supermaps, see Example 3. Then $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n, \mathbb{C}^m)$ is the set of (multiples of) generalized POVMs, which define measurements on $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n)$. If $n = 2k - 1$ and $\mathcal{B}_i = B(\mathcal{H}_i)$, $i = 0, \ldots, n$, then elemets in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n)$ are quantum combs and elements in $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_{2k-1}, U) := \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B}_0, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_n, \mathbb{C}^m)$ are called quantum k-testers, with values in U [3].

5 Extremality conditions

Let $J \subseteq \mathcal{A}^h$ be a positively generated subspace and let $K = J \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A})$. We will determine the faces and extreme points of the sets $\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ and $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$.

Theorem 2 *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$, with $p_u := s(M_u)$, $u \in U$. Then*

(i) The face of $\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ generated by M is the set

$$\{M' \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U),\ s(M'_u) = p_u,\ u \in U\}$$

(ii) M is extremal if and only if for any $D \in \oplus_u \mathcal{A}^h_{p_u}$, $\sum_u D_u \in J^\perp$ implies that $D_u = 0$ for all $u \in U$.

Proof. Let $L = \{y \in \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^h),\ \sum_u y_u \in I_\mathcal{A} + J^\perp\}$. Then L is an affine subspace and $\mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{y \in \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^h),\ \sum_u y_u \in J^\perp\}$. We have

$$\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U) = \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^+) \cap L,$$

so that we may use Lemmas 1 and 2 to finish the proof. Faces of $\ell_U(\mathcal{A}^+)$ are precisely the sets of the form $\oplus_u \mathcal{A}^+_{q_u}$, where $q_u \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$. Note also that we may replace $\mathcal{A}^h_{p_u}$ by $\mathcal{A}_{p_u}$ and $J^\perp$ by $J^\perp + iJ^\perp$ in (ii), see also Remark 1.

□

Extremal generalized POVMs were treated in [9] and another proof of the above theorem was found, see Theorem 3 there. Some other results are gathered in Proposition 5 below.

Let $M = \Lambda \circ \chi_d$ be the decomposition of M, $p := s(d)$. Let $J_d := \chi_d(J)$, then J_d is a positively generated subspace in $\mathcal{A}_p$. It is clear that the POVM Λ is a generalized POVM with respect to any subspace, hence in particular, $\Lambda \in \mathcal{M}_{J_d}(\mathcal{A}_p, U)$.

Proposition 5 *[9]*

(i) M is extremal in $\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ if and only if Λ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}_{J_d}(\mathcal{A}_p, U)$.

(ii) Let $M \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, U)$, so that M is a 1-tester, and $d = I_\mathcal{K} \otimes \omega$ for some state $\omega \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, $s(\omega) = q$. Then M is extremal if and only if $\mathrm{Tr}\,(q)^{-1}\Lambda$ is extremal in $\mathcal{C}(q\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K}, U)$.

(iii) If $m = 2$ in (ii), so that M is a 1-tester with 2 outcomes, then M is extremal if and only if $\Lambda = (\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ with Λ_1 a projection not commuting with any projection of the form $I_\mathcal{K} \otimes e$, with $e \neq 0, q$.

Example 6 For $\dim(\mathcal{K}) = \dim(\mathcal{H}) = 2$, all extremal 2-outcome 1-testers were characterized in [6, 9] as follows: If $\mathrm{rank}(\omega) = 1$, then M is extremal if and only if M is a PVM. If $\mathrm{rank}(\omega) = 2$, then M is extremal if and only if Λ_1 is a projection which is not of the form

$$\Lambda_1 = e \otimes |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + f \otimes |\psi^\perp\rangle\langle\psi^\perp|, \tag{7}$$

where $\psi, \psi^\perp \in \mathcal{H}$ are orthogonal unit vectors and $e, f \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{K})$.

Let us now turn to extremal measurements on K.

Theorem 3 *Let* $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}(K,U)$ *and let* $s(\mathbf{m}_u) = s_u$*,* $u \in U$*.*

(i) The face of $\mathcal{M}(K,U)$ *generated by* $\mathbf{m}$ *is*

$$\{\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{M}(K,U),\ s(\mathbf{m}'_u) = s_u, u \in U\}.$$

(ii) $\mathbf{m}$ *is extremal if and only if for any* $\mathbf{x} \in \oplus_u \pi(\mathcal{A}^h_{s_u})$*,* $\sum_u \mathbf{x}_u = \pi(0)$ *implies that* $\mathbf{x}_u = \pi(0)$ *for all* $u \in U$*.*

Proof. Let $L := \{\mathbf{x} \in \ell_U(J^*),\ \sum_u \mathbf{x}_u = \pi(I_{\mathcal{A}})\}$. Then L is an affine subspace in $\ell_U(J^*)$ and we have

$$\mathcal{M}(K,U) = \ell_U(Q^*) \cap L.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \ell_U(J^*),\ \sum_u \mathbf{x}_u = \pi(0)\}.$$

Now, (i) follows by Lemma 1 and Proposition 1. Moreover, the extremality condition in Lemma 2 has the form

$$\oplus_{u\in U}\, \pi(\mathcal{A}^h_{s_u}) \cap \mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{0\}, \tag{8}$$

where 0 is the zero element in $\ell_U(J^*)$, this implies (ii).

□

Corollary 2 *Let* $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}(K,U)$ *be extremal and let* $s(\mathbf{m}_u) = s_u$*. Then*

$$\sum_u \dim(J_{s_u}) \leq \dim(J).$$

Proof. From the extremality condition (8), we obtain by taking the orthogonal complements that

$$(\oplus_{u\in U}\pi(\mathcal{A}^h_{s_u}))^\perp \vee \mathrm{Lin}(L)^\perp = \ell_U(J^*),$$

which implies that

$$\sum_u \dim(\pi(\mathcal{A}_{s_u})) = \dim(\oplus_u \pi(\mathcal{A}_{s_u})) \leq \dim(\mathrm{Lin}(L)^\perp).$$

Let π_u be the quotient map $\mathcal{A}_{s_u} \to \mathcal{A}_{s_u}|_{J^{\perp_{s_u}}_{s_u}}$, see Lemma 6. Then since $J^{\perp_{s_u}}_{s_u} = J^\perp \cap \mathcal{A}_{s_u}$, it is easy to see that for elements $x, y \in \mathcal{A}_{s_u}$, $\pi(x) = \pi(y)$ if and only if $\pi_u(x) = \pi_u(y)$. It follows that

$$\dim(\pi(\mathcal{A}_{s_u})) = \dim(\pi_u(\mathcal{A}_{s_u})) = \dim(\mathcal{A}_{s_u}|_{J^{\perp_{s_u}}_{s_u}}) = \dim(J_{s_u}).$$

Moreover, $\mathrm{Lin}(L)^\perp$ is by definition a subspace in $\ell_U(J)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Lin}(L)^\perp &= \{y \in \ell_U(J),\ \langle \mathbf{x}, y\rangle = 0,\ \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathrm{Lin}(L)\} \\
&= \{y \in \ell_U(J),\ \sum_u \mathrm{Tr}\, x_u y_u = 0,\ \forall x \in \ell_U(\mathcal{A}^h),\ \sum_u x_u \in J^\perp\} \\
&= \{y \in \ell_U(J),\ y_u = y_v,\ \forall u, v \in U\} \equiv J,
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\dim(\mathrm{Lin}(L)^\perp) = \dim(J)$.

□

Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ and let $\pi(M) = \{\pi(M_u), u \in U\} \in \mathcal{M}(K, U)$ be the corresponding measurement. It is easy to see that if M is the unique element in its equivalence class, then $\mathcal{M}$ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ if and only if $\pi(M)$ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$. But if there are elements in $\mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ equivalent with M, none of the implications holds: there are non extremal generalized POVMs determining extremal measurements and extremal generalized POVMs such that the corresponding measurement is not extremal in $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$, see Example 7 below.

Corollary 3 *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ and let $s_u = s_J(M_u)$, $u \in U$. Then $\pi(M)$ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$ if and only if for any $D \in \oplus_u \mathcal{A}^h_{s_u}$, $\sum_u D_u \in J^\perp$ implies that $D_u \in J^\perp$ for all $u \in U$.*

Proof. Follows easily from Theorem 3. Note that again, we can have $D_u \in \mathcal{A}_{s_u}$ and $\sum_u D_u \in J^\perp \oplus iJ^\perp$.

□

Another way to express this condition is the following.

Corollary 4 *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$. Then $\pi(M)$ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}(K, U)$ if and only if whenever $M', N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ are such that $M'_u \in ri(G_J(M_u))$, $u \in U$, and $M' = \frac{1}{2}(N_1 + N_2)$, we have $\pi(M) = \pi(N_1) = \pi(N_2)$.*

Proof. Let $M' \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$, $M'_u \in ri(G_J(M_u))$, then $\pi(M) = \pi(M')$. Suppose $\pi(M)$ is extremal and let $N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ be such that $M' = \frac{1}{2}(N_1 + N_2)$. Then $\pi(M) = \pi(M') = \frac{1}{2}(\pi(N_1) + \pi(N_2))$, hence we must have $\pi(N_1) = \pi(N_2) = \pi(M)$.

Conversely, choose some $M' \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ with $M'_u \in ri(G_J(M_u)$ and let $s_u = s(M'_u) = s(\pi(M_u))$. Let $D \in \oplus_u \mathcal{A}^h_{s_u}$ be such that $\sum_u D_u \in J^\perp$. There is some $t > 0$ such that $M_{\pm,u} := M'_u \pm t D_u \geq 0$ for all u, and $\sum_u (M_\pm)_u \in I_\mathcal{A} + J^\perp$. Then $M_\pm \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ and $M' = \frac{1}{2}(M_+ + M_-)$, hence $\pi(M_\pm) = \pi(M)$, so that $D_u \in J^\perp$ for all u. By Corollary 3, $\pi(M)$ is extremal.

□

Let now $\sum_u M_u = d$, $p = s(d)$ and let $M = \Lambda \circ \chi_d$. Let us denote $K_d = J_d \cap \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{A}_p)$ and let π_d be the quotient map $\pi_d : \mathcal{A}^h_p \to \mathcal{A}^h_p|_{J_d^{\perp p}}$. We next show that under some condition on p, extremality of $\pi(M)$ is equivalent to extremality of $\pi_d(\Lambda)$.

Proposition 6 *Suppose that* $p \geq s(\sum_u N_u)$ *for all* $N \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ *equivalent with* M*. Then* $\pi(M)$ *is extremal in* $\mathcal{M}(J, U)$ *if and only if* $\pi_d(\Lambda)$ *is extremal in* $\mathcal{M}(K_d, U)$*.*

Proof. Let $N \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ be such that $N_u \in ri(G_J(M_u))$ for all $u \in U$. Then N is equivalent with M and we have $s_J(M_u) = s(N_u) \leq s(\sum_u N_u) \leq p$, so that $G_J(M_u) \subset \mathcal{A}_p$ for all u. It follows that χ_d is invertible on $G_J(M_u)$ and it is easy to see that χ_d^{-1} maps $G_J(M_u)$ onto $G_{J_d}(\Lambda_u)$.

Suppose that $\pi(\Lambda)$ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}(K_d, U)$. Let $M', M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}_J(\mathcal{A}, U)$ be such that $M'_u \in ri(G_J(M_u))$ for all u and $M' = \frac{1}{2}(M_1 + M_2)$. Let $N'_u := \chi_d^{-1}(M'_u)$, $(N_i)_u := \chi_d^{-1}((M_i)_u)$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $N', N_1, N_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{J_d}(\mathcal{A}_p, U)$, moreover, since χ_d is a linear map, we have $N'_u \in ri(G_{J_d}(\Lambda_u))$, by [10], and $N' = \frac{1}{2}(N_1 + N_2)$. Since Λ is extremal, this implies that $\pi_d(\Lambda) = \pi_d(N') = \pi_d(N_1) = \pi_d(N_2)$, that is, $(N_i)_u \in G_{J_d}(\Lambda_u)$, $u \in U$, $i = 1, 2$. Hence $(M_i)_u = \chi_d((N_i)_u) \in G_J(M_u)$, so that $\pi(M_1) = \pi(M_2) = \pi(M)$. By Corollary 4, $\pi(M)$ is extremal in $\mathcal{M}(J, U)$. The converse is proved the same way.

□

Remark 2 Note that Lemmas 1 and 2 can be used to determine the faces and extreme points of other interesting sets:

Extremal channels. Let $L = \{Y \in (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^h, \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}} Y = I_{\mathcal{A}}\}$. Then L is an affine subspace with $\mathrm{Lin}(L) = \{Y \in (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^h, \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}} Y = 0\}$ and

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^+ \cap L$$

Let $X \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and let $p = s(X)$. Then by Lemma 1, the face generated by X is determined by p. Moreover, by 2, X is extremal if and only if for $Y \in (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{A})^h_p$, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{B}} Y = 0$ implies $Y = 0$. It is clear that this condition can be extended to $Y \in (\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{H})_p$. Another extremality condition for channels was obtained in [5] in terms of Kraus operators, see [9] how these conditions are related.

Extremal instruments and POVMs. Let $\mathcal{A} = B(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{B} = \mathbb{C}^m \otimes B(\mathcal{K})$, so that $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is the set of instruments $B(\mathcal{H}) \to B(\mathcal{K})$ with values in $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Then the support of $X = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes X_i$ has the form $p = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes p_i$, $p_i = s(X_i)$. The extremality condition now becomes: for any $Y \in \oplus_i B(p_i(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}))$, $\sum_i \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} Y_i = 0$ implies $Y_i = 0$ for all i. As a particular case, for $\dim(\mathcal{K}) = 1$, we get an extremality condition for POVMs, obtained also in []. (Clearly, the same condition is obtained from Theorem 2 with $J = B(\mathcal{H})^h$.)

Extremal M-compatible instruments. This time, let $L = \{Y = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes Y_i, Y_i \in B(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H})^h, \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} Y_i = M_i^{\mathsf{T}}\}$, then the set of all M-compatible instruments has the form

$$(\mathbb{C}^m \otimes B(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}))^+ \cap L$$

Let $X = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes X_i$ be the Choi matrix of an M-compatible instrument, $p_i = s(X_i)$. Then X is extremal if and only if for all i, $Y_i \in B(p_i(\mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{H}))$, $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}} X_i = 0$ implies $X_i = 0$.

5.1 Extremal measurements on qubit channels

Let $M \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K},U)$, with $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \dim(\mathcal{K}) = 2$. We will characterize the situation when the corresponding measurement $\mathbf{m} = \pi(M)$ is extremal.

Let $J = J_{\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}}$ and let $Q = J \cap B(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})^+$.

Proposition 7 *The measurement* $\mathbf{m} = \pi(M)$ *is an extremal measurement on qubit channels if and only if* M *is an extremal qubit 1-tester and* $s(M_u) \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ *for all* $u \in U$*.*

Proof. Suppose that $\pi(M)$ is extremal. Then Corollary 3 implies that the support $s(\pi(M_u)) = s_J(M_u)$ cannot be equal to $I_{\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H}}$ for any $u \in U$. By Lemma 7, this implies $G_J(M_u) = \{M_u\}$ and hence $s(M_u) \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ for all u. Moreover, since M is the unique element in its equivalence class, M is an extremal 1-tester.

Conversely, since M is an extremal 1-tester, M_u must be extremal in $G_J(M_u)$ for all u. Since also $M_u \in ri(G_J(M_u))$, we have $G_J(M_u) = \{M_u\}$, so that $\pi(M)$ is extremal.

□

Let $M = \Lambda \circ \chi_{I\otimes\omega}$ be the decomposition of M and let $q = s(\omega)$. It is easy to see that $\chi_{I\otimes\omega}(J) = J_{q\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K},\omega}$. Let us denote $Q_\omega = J_{q\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K},\omega} \cap B(\mathcal{K}\otimes q\mathcal{H})^+$.

Corollary 5 $\pi(M)$ *is an extremal measurement on qubit channels if and only if* $\mathrm{Tr}\,(q)^{-1}\Lambda$ *is extremal in* $\mathcal{C}(q\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K},U)$ *and* $s(\Lambda_u) \in \mathcal{P}_{Q_\omega}(\mathcal{K}\otimes q\mathcal{H})$ *for all* $u \in U$*.*

Proof. Suppose first that $\omega = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| = q$ for some $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $M_u = N_u \otimes |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi| = \Lambda_u$ for some POVM N_u on $B(\mathcal{K})$ and it is easy to see that M is extremal if and only if N is an extremal POVM. But then $\mathrm{rank}(N_u) = 1$, hence also $\mathrm{rank}(M_u) = 1$ and by Lemma 7, $s(M_u) \in \mathcal{P}_Q(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$. Hence $\mathbf{m}$ is extremal if and only if $M = \Lambda$ is an extremal POVM. Since $Q_\omega = B(\mathcal{K}\otimes q\mathcal{H})^+$ in this case, this implies the assertion.

Suppose now that $\mathrm{rank}(\omega) = 2$. By Proposition 7 and Lemma 8, $\pi(M)$ is extremal if and only if M is an extremal 1-tester and $G_J(M_u) = \{M_u\}$ for all u. By the proof of Proposition 6, $\chi^{-1}_{I\otimes\omega}$ maps $G_J(M_u)$ onto $G_{J_\omega}(\Lambda_u)$, hence we have $G_J(M_u) = \{M_u\}$ if and only if $G_{J_\omega}(\Lambda_u) = \{\Lambda_u\}$. The statement now follows by Proposition 5 (ii) and Lemma 8.

□

The next Example shows an extremal qubit 1-tester, such that the corresponding measurement is not extremal.

Example 7 Let us apply the above results to the case of two outcomes. Let $M = (M_1, M_2)$ be a qubit 1-tester, such that $M_1 + M_2 = I\otimes\omega$, where $\mathrm{rank}(\omega) = 2$. Then M defines an extremal measurement on qubit channels if and only if $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{Q_\omega}(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ and Λ_1 is not of the form (7). In particular, suppose that $\Lambda_1 = |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$, then $\mathbf{m}$ is extremal if and only if $\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{K}}(|\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|) = \omega$. Indeed, this is equivalent with $\Lambda_2 \in P_{Q_\omega}(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$, moreover, $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{Q_\omega}(\mathcal{K}\otimes\mathcal{H})$ by Lemma 7 (i). Since ω has full rank, φ is not a product vector and hence M is an extremal 1-tester, by Example 7. The converse is clear. In particular, if $\omega = 1/2I_{\mathcal{H}}$, then M is extremal if and only if the vector φ is maximally entangled.

On the other hand, if φ is not a product vector but also not maximally entangled, then M defines an extremal qubit 1-tester such that the corresponding measurement on qubit channels is not extremal.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the grants VEGA 2/0032/09, meta-QUTE ITMS 26240120022 and by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract No. APVV-0178-11.

References

[1] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, Quantum circuit architecture, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101 (2008), 060401

[2] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Memory effects in quantum channel discrimination, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101 , 180501 (2008).

[3] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, Theoretical framework for quantum networks, Phys. Rev. A 80 (2009), 022339

[4] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, D.M. Schlingemann, R.F. Werner, A short impossibility proof of Quantum Bit Commitment, arXiv:0905.3801

[5] M.D. Choi, Completely positive maps on complex matrices, Lin. Alg. Appl. 10 (1975), 285-290

[6] G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, M. Sedlak, Extremal quantum protocols, J. Math. Phys. 52, 082202 (2011)

[7] G. Gutoski, J. Watrous, Toward a general theory of quantum games, Proceedings of the 39th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 565574, 2007

[8] A. Jenčová, Generalized channels: channels for convex subsets of the state space, J. Math. Phys. 53, 012201 (2012), arXiv:1105.1899

[9] A. Jenčová, Extremality conditions for generalized channels, arXiv:1204.2752

[10] T. Rockafellar, *Convex Analysis*, Princeton University Press, 1970 Princeton

[11] M. Ziman, Process POVM: A mathematical framework for the description of process tomography experiments, Phys. Rev. A 77, 062112 (2008)